<u>REMARKS</u>

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 29, 2008. Claims 28-47 are presented for examination, of which Claims 28 and 38 are in independent form. Claims 28 and 38 have been amended to define Applicants' invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 28-47 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,917,969 (*Aggarwal et al.*), in view of a document entitled, "Understanding JavaServer Pages Model 2 architecture" (*Seshadri*), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,990,654 (*Carroll, Jr.*). Applicants submit that independent Claims 28 and 38, together with the claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is directed to providing standardized input interface elements using Extensible Markup Language (XML), including receiving a request for a webpage and a first file corresponding to the webpage. An XML tag including a field name is obtained from the first file and used to obtain from a second file a formatting instruction corresponding to the field name. Program code corresponding to an input interface element specified in the formatting instruction is then formatted. The program code is configured to enable a value corresponding to the field name to be input via the input interface element. A third file including the program code corresponding to the input interface element is generated and is transmitted using a communications network.

Notable features of Claim 1 include "using the XML tag to obtain, from a second file, a formatting instruction corresponding to the field name" and "formatting program code corresponding to an input interface element specified in the formatting instruction, wherein the

program code is configured to enable a value corresponding to the field name to be input via the input interface element." By virtue of these features, a system implementing the method of Claim 1 provides standardized input interface elements for webpages.

Aggarwal et al. relates to cross-platform rendering of content in variable presentation environments. *Seshadri* relates to a Model-View-Controller (MVC) design for separating presentation from content using JavaServer Pages (JSP). As noted by the Examiner on page 4 of the Office Action, the combination of *Aggarwal et al.* and *Seshadri* does not teach *input* interface elements.

Carroll, Jr. relates to a system and a method for utilizing an interface library to create application interfaces. Apparently, *Carroll, Jr.* teaches that drop-down menu items may be defined in an XML file (col. 19, lines 1-67).

Applicants submit that a combination of *Aggarwal et al.*, *Seshadri*, and *Carroll, Jr.*, assuming such combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest "using the XML tag to obtain a formatting instruction, from a second file, corresponding to the field name" and "formatting program code corresponding to an input interface element specified in the formatting instruction, wherein the program code is configured to enable a value corresponding to the field name to be input via the input interface element," as recited in Claim 28.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 28 is patentable over the cited art, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Independent Claim 38 includes features similar to that discussed above, in which an XML tag is used to obtain a formatting instruction, from a second file, corresponding to the field name, and that program code corresponding to an input interface element specified in the formatting instruction is

formatted, where the program code is configured to enable a value corresponding to the field name to be input via the input interface element. Therefore, Claim 38 also is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 06-1205.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan Berschadsky/
Jonathan Berschadsky
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,551

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
FCHS_WS 2197282_1.DOC